REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.   The Examiner has maintained the earlier rejection of claims 16-19 and 53-56 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw in view of Wong.

Both the present claims and the cited references provide for searching. The claims, however, require displaying a graphical model of a component, allowing a user to select the graphical model, performing a search of a component database using metadata attributes associated with a selected component and dynamically creating a search menu using the metadata attributes associated with the component. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Shaw nor Wong teach or otherwise suggest these four elements. In the Office action dated September 16, 2004, the Examiner argued that the elements of displaying a graphical model of a component, allowing a user to select the graphical model, performing a search of a component database using metadata attributes associated with a selected component, and dynamically creating a search menu using the metadata attributes associated with the component are taught by Shaw "presenting the user with a graphical user interface for allowing the user to perform a search." The fact that Shaw presents a graphical user interface (as virtually all computer systems do) is irrelevant. Shaw clearly does not display a graphical model of a component in the context of using a collaborative commerce application for searching for a component. Since Shaw does not display a graphical model of a component, Shaw clearly does not allow a user to select the graphical model and perform a search of a component database using metadata attributes associated with the selected component. Finally, Shaw does not **dynamically** create a search menu using metadata attributes associated with the component, but rather presents predetermined search menus. The Examiner's interpretation of the claims appears to completely ignore the term "dynamically." In the context of the present claims, the search menu is **dynamically** created because the metadata attributes for the search menu are not known until the component is selected.

Similarly, Wong does not teach or otherwise suggested these claim elements. For example, Wong does not teach dynamically creating a search menu using metadata attributes of a component. Rather, Wong teaches a static search. The Wong search requires the user to enter information (i.e., product search parameters) into various fields

of a search screen to find desired products within a database (Col. 13, lines 12-15).

Unlike the dynamic search menu in the current claims, the Wong search screen is static.

In other words, the displayed search fields do not depend on the desired component and

are the same for every search (Fig. 4, Col. 13, lines 11-15). The Wong search then

produces a product list based on the search results (Col. 13, lines 24-29). Wong does not

allow the user to select a component from a graphical display and dynamically create the

search menu displaying metadata attributes of the component as required by the claims.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention as claimed is

allowable over Shaw both alone and in combination with Wong.

2.   All pending claims are believed to be in a form suitable for allowance. Therefore,

the application is believed to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully

requests early allowance of the application. The Applicant requests that the Examiner

contact the undersigned, Jeffrey T. Klayman, if it will assist further examination of this

application.

Date: October 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey T. Klayman
Registration No. 39,250
Attorney for Applicants

Bromberg & Sunstein LLP
125 Summer Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-1618
Tel: (617) 443-9292
Fax: (617) 443-0004

02686/00113 430455.1